



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

seal of confession." Here as elsewhere the author is anxious to show that the great body of English Roman Catholics were not guilty of either privity or sympathy with the machinations of the Jesuits.

The remainder of the book calls for little comment. Except in one or two places the story from this point dwindles into a meager chronicle. Regarding the position and influence of Father Petre, evidence is cited to show that James II. was a mere tool in his hands, while the Jesuit father himself was the scape-goat of others—*i. e.*, of the General, the Provincial, and the Confessor of the society. However, one would think that a safer guide might have been chosen for the characterization of Father Petre than Macaulay. It is interesting to note that Father Taunton goes so far as to attribute the fall of the Stuarts to the influence of Parsons and the society.

Certain statements made by the writer might be questioned. For example, Gardiner has shown that James I. never knowingly signed the letter to the Pope requesting that the Scotch bishop of Vazion be made a cardinal; again one would like the authority for the assertion that the King had no intention of "carrying out" the Spanish marriage. Later Charles II. is unjustly blamed for the failure to carry out the provisions of the Treaty of Breda with regard to liberty of conscience. Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury, was perhaps the "chief and leader of the anti-Catholic party," yet it is hardly true to say that it was under his auspices that the Popish Plot was formed.

The dignity of the author's style is marred by an occasional colloquialism. In general, though the work contains much information, it can scarcely be regarded as a complete and well-proportioned history of the whole subject. The index, though long and full, is lacking in one or two important points. There is an appendix containing extracts from the writings of Parsons.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

*Russian Political Institutions.* By MAXIME KOVALEVSKY. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1902. Pp. ix, 299.)

*A History of Russia from the Birth of Peter the Great to Nicholas II.* By W. R. MORFILL. (New York: James Pott and Co. 1901. Pp. viii, 486.)

HOWEVER much the above two works may differ in other respects, they have at least one trait in common—they are both difficult reading. For Professor Kovalevsky we must make allowances. The lectures which he delivered last year at the University of Chicago, and which are here reproduced, should be judged with the leniency due any man writing in a language not his own. It is, therefore, needless to insist on the faults of his style, even when he goes so far as to use the phrase "meddled with" when he means intermixed with; and, by a stretch of charity, it is also possible to ascribe a number of pretty loose historical statements to his incomplete mastery of English phrase. Still, no indulgence can absolve him from the charge of having overloaded his lectures with a

confused mass of detail, much of which could hardly be comprehensible without considerable previous knowledge on the part of his hearers or readers. It is all obviously unsuited to the average American public. Even less pardonable, because quite evitable, is the only too evident fact that, if Professor Kovalevsky has not a perfect acquaintance with English, his proof-reader must have been utterly ignorant of Russian. The glaring, absurd mistakes in the Russian words used are innumerable ; and as there is also more than one misprinted date, the total effect is very slovenly. Surely, it would have been possible to find somebody in Chicago who could have remedied this, and have saved the credit of a press that is a recognized part of a well-known university. What can one say, too, to the sending to "the Literary Editor" of three ready-made notices which "may be of value in connection with your review columns"?

However, after disregarding all defects of form and accompaniment, we can admit that the substance of Professor Kovalevsky's work is of serious value. He writes with knowledge and authority, even if carelessly. His familiarity with the broader fields of law and economics has been of service in fitting him for the task of interpreting to foreigners the institutions of his native land. His bias is by no means ultra-national ; indeed, in his last two chapters, those on Poland and Finland, he does not even present fairly the Russian side of the case. His general stand-point is that of an admirer of parliamentary institutions, as we are warned by his preface, where he says that he has "no doubt that the difficulties which Russia has to undergo, and which arise from her present internal conditions, have no other cause than the interruption of the evolution already begun in favor of a constitutional monarchy. The only loser in this case will be, of course, bureaucracy." This is sweeping enough to show us that we must not look for a perfectly objective treatment of his theme on the part of the writer. His topic is well worth study. Russian institutions and their development are little known to the western public, and it is by no means easy to get at reliable information about them. Despite the many features in them that have been borrowed from the outside, they have a strong national element, and they deserve much more serious attention than they have received in other countries. We have here an attempt to fill a gap, so that even if there still remains plenty of room we can be grateful for what we have got. It is to be regretted that, owing presumably to carelessness, the author has not escaped some pretty serious errors of detail—for instance, in spite of fresh information, the question as to the identity of "the false Demetrius" seems as far as ever from being settled, and he probably was not "a certain Grishka Otrepiev" (p. 56). The Juriev represented at the Sobor of Michael Romanov in 1642 evidently could not be "the modern Dorpat," then in the hands of Sweden, but was Juriev-Polski, in the present government of Vladimir. It is not true that the Tsarevich Alexis was "executed by the orders of his own father, Peter the Great" (p. 110). He was condemned by the court which Peter had instituted, and the

sentence was confirmed ; but the prince died before it could be carried out, thus leaving a possibility of doubt whether it ever would have been. On the next page we read that Elizabeth "was a bastard, for there was nothing to prove a marriage between Peter the Great and Catherine." Peter publicly married Catherine in 1712, after the campaign of the Pruth. The attacks on the legitimacy of their daughters were due to the fact that both of them were born before this marriage, and that Peter's first wife was still alive. The reference to the murder of Ivan VI. (p. 124) is unpardonably wrong. Mirovich was not "the man who perpetrated it," but, on the contrary, was trying to free the captive, who was put to death by his keepers to prevent the rescue. Finally, Alexander I. was the grandson, not "the great-grandson" (p. 286), of Catherine II. These are not the only errors, but when all is said, one can read Professor Kovalevsky's book with a good deal of profit.

The same remark can hardly hold true of Mr. Morfill's last work. He has written for "the general reader," but it is hard to imagine anything more confusing to such a reader than his jumble of names and facts, and his sudden digressions and sub-digressions in every possible direction. The garrulousness of his style is at times absolutely bewildering. Although he may have, as he says, mostly drawn from Russian sources, and have freely availed himself of the material furnished, not only by the leading historians of the country, but also of what is contained in the historical reviews and the transactions of Russian learned societies, it profits us but little : his narrative consists often of hardly more than a string of disconnected anecdotes. There is no sense of proportion. For instance, though it may be worth while to devote over fifty pages to Napoleon's Moscow campaign, especially as this is the best written part of the book, still, all the subsequent events in the reign of Alexander I., such as the campaigns in Germany and France, the Congress of Vienna, the Holy Alliance and the reactionary policy of the last years, deserve more than a total of fifteen. And yet this is a trifle compared with the fact that in a history of modern Russia an event of the most transcendent importance, which has been called perhaps the greatest legislative act in the history of mankind, the emancipation of the forty million serfs by Alexander II., is disposed of in a page and a half, much less than is squandered away on many a superfluous anecdote.

After this it is hard to treat the work seriously, as it rambles on, from one subject to another. The beginning is characteristic. We get to an anecdote in the third line, and in the preamble thereof we meet the extraordinary pronouncement that "Alexis was perhaps the first Tsar who had what would now be called a foreign policy." Typical of Mr. Morfill's looseness is his calling Maria Theresa indiscriminately "the German Empress" and "the Austrian Empress," both terms open to criticism. As for his general views, one notes that he carries his partizanship of Peter the Great to the point of glossing over the terrible story of the Tsarevich Alexis ; that he does not do justice to the statesmanship of Bestuzhev, the minister of the Empress Elizabeth ; that in dealing with

Peter III. and Catherine II. he attaches, characteristically enough, too much importance to the untrustworthy gossip of Rulhière ; that he has a rhetorical aversion to the Turks, and gives a false idea of the respective strength of the opposing fleets at the Battle of Navarino ; that his attitude towards "the great emperor" Nicholas I. is in the main sympathetic, while his tone toward the French in the Crimean War is throughout fault-finding and unfair. He abounds in loose and hazardous statements, but it is needless here to point out his errors of detail, some of which are, doubtless, mere slips. For the "general reader" the book contains not a little useful information if he can succeed in extracting and remembering it. Mr. Morfill has a wide knowledge of Slavic history and languages, and a kindly personality shines through his pages, but oh ! how could an Oxford professor use the word "researcher"?

ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE.

*The Development of Cabinet Government in England.* By MARY TAYLOR BLAUVELT, M.A. (New York : The Macmillan Co. 1902. Pp. xvi, 300.)

In this volume the author shows the historical origin of the English Cabinet and traces the successive steps in its development. The discussion begins with the differentiation of the Cabinet from the Privy Council and ends with the early years of the reign of Queen Victoria. The author has done her work well and has made a valuable contribution to historical and political literature. The importance of the subject can scarcely be overestimated. The Cabinet is the most important feature of the English government. It sways and guides the House of Commons, which is the real governing power in England ; and its history has never before been presented in monographic form. Traill, Todd, Anson and others have given us brief sketches of the development of special phases of the Cabinet but the subject has never before been treated in a connected and detailed way. This has been well done in the volume now under discussion, and the book has, therefore, a distinct place in the literature of the subject.

The author's task has not been an easy one. The development of the Cabinet has extended over a long period of time, hence it was necessary to work over an immense amount of historical material. This appears to have been conscientiously done as the author, for the most part, has consulted the original sources. Some readers will regret that the author did not see fit to bring the discussion down to a somewhat later period. The book practically closes with the accession of Queen Victoria, and there are some interesting phases of Cabinet development in the reign of the late Queen which might well be made the subject of an additional chapter. Such a continuation would add force and a degree of completeness to the volume which it now lacks. In fact the concluding pages of the book are weak because of too great condensation.